



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,654	07/28/2003	Morton Beroza	MR3277-2/CIP	4431
4586	7590	04/20/2005	EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101 ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043			ROWAN, KURT C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/627,654	Applicant(s) BEROZA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kurt Rowan	Art Unit 3643	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Su (US 6,052,066) for substantially the same reasons stated in the first Office Action.

The patent to Su shows establishing a central monitoring station and at least one remote monitoring station (sensors) as shown in Fig. 1. Su shows acquiring a sensed biometric signal at the remote monitoring station which is the insect activating the sensor in some way. Su transmits the signal from the remote station and receives that signal at the central monitoring station. In reference to claim 1, it is not clear if Su analyses the sensed biometric signal of the targeted insect at the site and then sends a signal to the central monitoring station or automatically sends a signal. At any rate, it would have been obvious to analyze the signal at the remote detection station to avoid false positive signals which would then entail an operator making a trip to check that sensor. Note that Su discloses using computer software in column 4, lines 19-20 to filter out overlapped pest and then identifies the pest. In reference to claims 2 and 6, Su discloses acoustic emission devices which would produce an acoustic signal. In reference to claim 3, shows a detector which acts as a coarse signal detector. Inherently Su has a power control device. Su shows an analog to digital signal

converter as disclosed in column 5, lines 26-27. It is within the purview of one skilled in the art to employ a digital signal processor with an analog to digital signal converter. In reference to claim 4, Su clearly contemplates polling a remote station from the central monitoring station to check the operation integrity thereof as discussed in column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 9 by using an analog test signal. In reference to claim 5, Su does not disclose a radio frequency transmitter or an antenna to send the signal to the central monitoring station, but it would have been obvious to employ a radio frequency transmitter and an antenna to send the signal without cables or lines. The examiner takes Official Notice that radio frequency transmitters and antennas are old and well known in the art and that it would have been obvious to employ them in place of cables or telephone lines for the purpose of ease of use such as in place where the cable run would be very long. In reference to claim 7, Su discloses a trap 30 in column 3, line 40. Su discloses in column 7, lines 26-36, that other detectors could be employed such as acoustic emission or a digital balance. In reference to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 2, above. In reference to claim 9, Su discloses a pheromone attractant in column 3, line 45. In reference to claim 10, see the rejection of claim 3, above. In reference to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 4, above. In reference to claims 12, 13, Su discloses a remote electronic beeper, but it would have been obvious to employ a signal with the positive alert signal to tell the operator which station is sending the signal. In reference to claims 14, 15, Su employ computer software to analyze the sensed biometric signal as disclosed in column 4, lines 19-21 which can be considered to be executing a sequence of processing steps stored in a computer readable medium. In

reference to claim 16, it is not clear if Su includes the executes the processing steps in the digital signal processor or not, but it would have been obvious to do so since the function is the same and no unexpected results were shown. In reference to claim 17, Su does not disclose that the digital signal processor is operable to automatically generate a cross-correlation measure between the sensed biometric signal and the characteristic biometric signal, but it would have been obvious to determine this measurement so that an accurate determination could be made as to the nature of the sensed signal, i.e., is it a false positive or the signal from a non-target species.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed Feb 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's response overcomes the objections to the claim and the provisional double patenting rejection. In column 7, line 30-31 of Su, it is disclosed that acoustic emission devices can be used as sensors which would detect a sensed biometric condition. It would be reasonable to have a characteristic stored biometric condition to compare the sensed signal to for the purpose of determining what insect is causing the acoustic signal. However, Su does not appear to analyze the sensed biometric condition in situ but either at remote data collection unit or at a central processing unit both of which can be considered as processor-based verification. At any rate, it would have been obvious to provide Su with in situ analysis of the sensed biometric signal since the function is the same and no stated problem is solved.

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is 571 272 6893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703 308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kurt Rowan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Kurt Rowan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3643

KR